REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-5, 12-16 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Independent claims 1, 12 and 23 are amended taking into consideration the Examiner comments. Withdrawal of the rejections is requested.

Claims 1-6, 9, 11-17, 19, 20, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Estes et al. (U.S. 2003/0208411) in view of Franklin et al. (6,125,352).

Claims 7 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Estes and Franklin, and further in view of Kirner (US 2002/00446040).

Claims 10 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Estes and Franklin, and further in view of Iannacci (US 2002/0062249).

The claims are amended, and, thus, the pending claims remain for reconsideration, which is requested. No new matter has been added.

The independent claims are 1, 6, 12, 17 and 23, which are rejected over Estes and Franklin. The rejections are traversed as follows:

(1) The Office Action Response to Arguments acknowledges that Estes does not disclose registering a plurality of addresses in correspondence to a unique address identification.

(2) So the Office Action relies upon Franklin to register a user with multiple addresses. However, Franklin FIGS. 9 and 11, operations 942, 954, 1112, 1114, only disclose the use of a nickname as an identifier to derive a registered address data when an individual registers an address data on the personal computer. In other words, Franklin discusses selecting a shipping address using a nickname, such as "office" or "Debbie's house," so Franklin only discusses a single nickname associated with a single address. Franklin does not disclose expressly or implicitly registering a plurality of addresses in correspondence to a unique address identification, namely the language of claim 1 expressly provides "***establishing a respective unique address identification (ID) for each of*** ~~said~~***the plurality of delivery addresses***."

Further, Franklin does not disclose the configuration that the purchaser requests a delivery to a vendor that identifies the delivery address by using a nickname, namely "accepting delivery request data generated by a vendor of ~~said~~the merchandise based upon *a delivery request from the purchaser, ~~said~~the delivery request data including the unique address ID as delivery address of either the purchaser or the non-purchaser*" and the vendor cannot reverse translate the nickname into the underlying or associated address data, namely "*establishing a respective unique address identification (ID) for each of ~~said~~the plurality of delivery addresses ... the unique address IDs being invulnerable to reverse translation by a third party into ~~said~~the address data.*"

In other words, the language of claim 1 does not merely recite use of a nickname for a shipping address, but the language of claim 1 expressly provides "*accepting delivery request data generated by a vendor* of ~~said~~the merchandise based upon a delivery request from the purchaser, ~~said~~the delivery request data including the unique address ID as delivery address ...*" Further, a benefit of the invention is that the vendor does not know the actual delivery address, namely the language of claim 1 provides "*the unique address IDs being invulnerable to reverse translation by a third party into ~~said~~the address data.*" It is readily apparent that Franklin's system configuration in FIG. 1 and as discussed in FIGS. 9 and 10 does not accommodate the combination of the claimed features of the vendor accepting a delivery request having a unique address ID which the vendor does not know the underlying address data. In fact, Franklin teaches away from claim 1, because the merchants A and B know the nickname to address data association.

Therefore, a prima facie case of obviousness based upon Estes and Franklin cannot be established, because there is no evidence that one skilled in the art would combine Estes and Franklin and then further modify either Estes and/or Franklin to provide the combination of the claimed features, namely "establishing *a respective unique address identification (ID) for each of ~~said~~the plurality of delivery addresses ... the unique address IDs being invulnerable to reverse translation by a third party into ~~said~~the address data,*" and "*accepting delivery request data generated by a vendor* of ~~said~~the merchandise based upon a delivery request from the purchaser, ~~said~~the *delivery request data including the unique address ID as delivery address ...,*" and seen a benefit of the vendor accepting a delivery request having a unique address ID which the vendor does not know the underlying address

data, and the benefit of the unique address ID being "*for each of ~~said~~the plurality of delivery addresses*."

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and allowance of claim 1 is requested.

Independent claims 6, 12, 17 and 23 require limitations similar to the discussed limitations and other limitations.

Withdrawal of the rejection of pending claims and allowance of pending claims is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

/Mehdi D. Sheikerz/

Date: _____December 15, 2008_____   By: _____

Mehdi D. Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501